wages. The claim of the Contractor was not tenable under the terms of the Contract and was, accordingly, rejected. As the Contractor asked for appointment of an Arbitrator to resolve the dispute, in terms of the contract a panel of Arbitrators was sent to the Contractor to select a Sole Arbitrator from the panel. However, the Contractor requested that the award, as and when made, in the dispute pending between another Contractor and the project may be made applicable to them also. On examination of their request from the legal angle, it was found that such a request could not be acceded to and the Contractor was informed accordingly by the NHPC. Thereafter, no reference asking for the appointment of the Sole Arbitrator has been received from the Contractor by the N.H.P.C.

Ban on the production of poisonous Pesticides

25. SHRI N.E. BALARAM : Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there is a large scale and regular poisoning and deaths all over the country from aluminium phosphide and if so, what are the details thereof for the last three years, State-wise for the above pesticide and for all other registered pesticides; and

(b) whether in view of widespread damage production of such chemicals will be banned till suitable infrastructure for control is fully in operation?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO): (a) Aluminium Phosphide is used as a fumigant in storage of foodgrains and is registered for use under the provisions of Insecticides Act. Certain instances of death due to use of AIuminium Phosphide for suicide/ homocide purpose have however been reported. As per the information available with the Deptt of Agriculture, deaths due to pesticides poisoning reported from different states are as under:

State	Year	Total No. of poison-cases	Deaths
Gujarat	1986	6	6
Tamilnadu	1986	5	5
Punjab	1986-87	126	126
A.P.	1988	16	
Kerala	1987	40	

(b) The Registration Committee constituted under the Insecticides Act have imposed restrictions on its sale. Accordingly, its sale is permitted only to Govt, organisations like Warehousing Corp., Food Corporation of India etc. for use under strict supervision of experts whose expertise is approved by the Plant Protection Adviser to the Govt, of India. In view of the above regulations, it is not considered necessary to impose a ban at the present stage.

Observation of norms by pesticide manufacturers

26. SHRI N. E. BALA RAM: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether pesticide units are to be asked to observe norms on pesticide formulations which they have been flouting for the past several years as reported in the Economic Times of 1st April, *1989;*

(b) if so, what corrective action has been taken so far against those disregarding the Government guidelines and reasons for not taking corrective action; and

(c) whether it is a fact that the pesticide manufacturers have been

making heavy profits on formulations and if so, whether Government ■would impose restrictions on too many formulations which confuse the farmers users, and also refer the case to the MRTPC/National Consumer Protection Commission?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO) : (a) and (b) Government have been issuing instructions for and monitoring observance of norms for selling of technical pesticides to non-associated formulators. A meeting was also held recently with the basic manufacturers, formulators and industry associations to discuss the issues (referred to in the news item). All manufacturers have agreed to adhere to the norms as per their licence condition.

(c) No, Sir. We have no information on such profiteering. The question of any restriction on formulations or reference to MRTPC/ NCPC does not arise.

27. *[Transferred to the 28th April,* 1989].

Safety of Maruti Gypsy

28. SHRI SHAMIM HASHMI: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have seen recent reports in Sunday Mail of 26th February, 1989 regarding safety of Gypsy and letter of Dr. Dinesh Mohan on the same subject in the Indian Express of 9th March, 1939 and if so, what is Government's response thereto

(b) whether Government have verified Maruti Company's claim that Indian version of Maruti Gypsy is different from the U.S. Suzuki Samurai and if so, what are the details thereof; and

(c) whether it is correct that Maruti Gypsy has been tested by VRDE and ARAI under conditions similar to those reported by US consumer Union for the Avoidance Manoeuvre Test and if so, what are the findings?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir. The comparison between Maruti Gypsy and Suzuki Samurai vehicles is given in the enclosed Statement *(See* below).

(c) Maruti Gypsy has been tested before introduction in the country by ARAI. YRDE has also conducted extensive tests including the manoeuvrability and steerabilit trials of Maruti Gypsy on the dry serpentine course of VRDE tria track with maximum controllable speed. VRDE has concluded that Maruti Gypsy has satisfactory dynamic stability under normal drivrag conditions.

Statement

	Maruti Gypsy MG 410	Samurai SJ 413
Overall Height (mm)	**. 4010**	**3430**
Overall Height (mm)	**. 1460**	**1540**
Overall Height (mm)	**. 1910**	**1165**
Wheel base (mm)	**2375**	**2030**
Tread front (mm)	**1210**	**1300**